

CENTER ROUTING SLIP

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

TSG

19 August 1970

TO	INITIALS	DATE	REMARKS
DIRECTOR			
DEP/DIRECTOR	2	MM 8/20	I have sent copies of the attached to [redacted]
EXEC/DIRECTOR	1	SP 8/20	Legislative Counsel and [redacted] as you instructed.
SPECIAL ASST			
ASST TO DIR	3	TAL 8/21	
HISTORIAN			
CH/PPBS			
DEP CH/PPBS			
EXO/PPBS			
CH/SS			
DEP CH/SS			
SC & P			
RECORDS MGT			
PERSONNEL			
LOGISTICS			
TRAINING			
SECURITY			
FINANCE			
CH/IEG			
DEP CH/IEG			
EXO/IEG			
CH/PSG			
DEP CH PSG			
EXO PSG			
CH/TSG			
DEP CH/ TSG			DECLASS REVIEW by NGA
EXO/TSG			
DIR/IAS/DDI			
CH/DIAXX-4			
CH/ DIAAP-9			

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

25X1

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

1. On 18 August 1970, a meeting was held in [redacted] to discuss 25X1
the evaluation of the prototype [redacted] 1540 Model II Light Table. In 25X1
attendance were:

NPIC - [redacted]

25X1

[redacted]

25X1

2. [redacted] opened the meeting by stating that the [redacted] 25X1
[redacted] had requested the meeting. He asked if [redacted] had specific 25X1
questions they wished to have answered. [redacted] stated that 25X1
he had questions on the short comings of their equipment:

a. In what ways were the systems and subsystems of the [redacted] 25X1
Table deficient? How were they relative to the [redacted] table? 25X1

b. In the evaluation of the tables, was past performance of the
companies rated? Did managerial, technical, or any other factors
influence the evaluation?

c. He had questions on the equality of the evaluation. He
stated he heard rumors about the evaluation.

d. Is the [redacted] Table built to the same specifications as the
[redacted] table?

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

- 25X1 e. Was [redacted] allowed to make more corrections to their table during the evaluation period?
- 25X1 f. Was the [redacted] table over engineered and if so, was this brought out at the critique.
- 25X1 3. [redacted] pointed out that his organization carried out a quantitative evaluation and not a subjective one. [redacted] suggested that it might answer most of the questions if [redacted] briefed on his evaluation of the "fixes" made to the [redacted] table. [redacted] gave the same briefing he gave the Executive Director, NPIC, on 4 August. He stated that the deficiencies had been corrected with the exception of:
- a. Excessive temperature at the film plane after 4.5 hours operation with 2.0 density film.
 - b. Rate control of the carriage movement was still too high.
 - c. Dirt still got under the glass.
- 25X1 4. [redacted] said they would like to know what must be done to improve the equipment and make it competitive. [redacted] stated that we would be glad to discuss the short comings and corrections to the [redacted] table but would not give a comparison of systems and subsystems of the [redacted] tables. He explained that a time problem existed during the evaluation period and the Center made an engineering judgement of which table came closest to meeting specifications and the PI needs. He stated that both tables did not totally meet specs and that the short comings were reviewed with T&E and IEG and the decision had to be made on

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B0570A000200010024-7

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

a time basis. He stated that if the [redacted] had initially contained all these "fixes" it could have influenced our decision.

25X1

25X1 5. [redacted] asked when the decision was made to go with

[redacted] said it would be difficult to answer since there are many decision points in our procurement cycle. This varies from the operational request to the executive sign off. He thought it might have occurred in June. [redacted] stated that they had demonstrated some fixes in April and some in mid-June. He asked if the decision had been made prior to mid-June. [redacted] stated that due to our

25X1

procurement cycle, the decision had to be made prior to the end of June and technical and cost considerations both entered the picture. He said he would not hazard a guess if present [redacted] table and different price would have won the competition. [redacted] said they ran operational

25X1

tests on both tables in March and April. The PIs felt they could immediately go to work on the [redacted] table but they desired further features. The PIs felt they could not do this with the [redacted] table.

25X1

25X1 6. [redacted] was allowed in more frequently for repairs. [redacted] said he could not state how many times each

company was in for repairs. He stated that the ground rules were that a contractor would be allowed in for repairs only if the malfunction would cause the termination of the T&E tests. [redacted] stated that 8 series of PIs were used in the operational tests. There was very little down time for either table. Cost information was withheld and only the

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

operation of the table was used in the evaluation. [redacted]

25X1

asked what items prevented the [redacted] table being used immediately.

25X1

[redacted] stated that the film drives, the heat problem, and the film tracking prevented its immediate use.

25X1

7. [redacted] stated that the over temperature of the drive systems was caused by a failure of a component that was allowed to remain uncorrected during the evaluation period. He thought this might have seriously affected the evaluation. [redacted] stated this was not the case. A list was made of all the faults and a description made of the seriousness of the fault. In all cases, faults had detailed rationales as to their seriousness. Heat in PI space did not alone reject the table.

25X1

25X1

[redacted] stated that the 70 mm tracking was a very serious problem during the operational evaluation. [redacted] stated this did not

25X1

25X1

occur initially at the [redacted] plant. The first [redacted] knew of this was when the table was returned to [redacted] after the critique. Mr.

25X1

25X1

[redacted] stated that we have to assume that the table is in proper working order and ready for evaluation when it is delivered to us.

25X1

25X1

8. [redacted] was asked in more often during the T&E. [redacted] stated that they were not asked in more as far as he is aware. [redacted] stated that [redacted] had one recurring problem and

25X1

25X1

[redacted] two problem areas. [redacted] did not know the dates and number of visits. He said [redacted] worked on the carriage drives several times when it stopped the tests but that [redacted] was not allowed to make other fixes during these visits.

25X1

25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

25X1 9. [redacted] asked if any other groups had been involved
25X1 in the evaluation. [redacted] stated that we brokered the evaluation
for the Community through our TOC and operational people.

25X1 10. [redacted] said he is still at a loss to get a hold on
25X1 the situation. He asked what it is about the [redacted] table that is not
satisfactory or is less satisfactory than the [redacted] table. He said [redacted]
needed to learn what you are not happy with and what makes the [redacted] 25X1
table "less good". [redacted] stated that this had been pretty well
25X1 covered by [redacted] telling what was wrong and by [redacted] 25X1
explaining the time frame.

25X1 11. [redacted] asked what does the Center prefer in a table
25X1 beyond the specs. [redacted] explained that no one table could please
every PI but that the PI could not possibly live with the [redacted] table 25X1
as it was during the operational evaluation.

25X1 12. [redacted] stated that if they could have looked at the
25X1 table prior to 4 May, certain fixes might have been made. [redacted]
stated that they were provided a critique once the T&E had been completed
but that there had been some procrastination on [redacted] part in responding 25X1
to fixes to the problems highlighted at the critique.

25X1 13. [redacted] stated that the tracking problem was not clear at
25X1 [redacted] *stated this was not true*
the critique, and that it was the number one item addressed on the [redacted]
List of Fixes, dated 24 May. [redacted] also stated that it was 25X1
discussed at the critique. [redacted] stated that the tracking and 25X1
hunting problem had not been corrected in late June.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

25X1 14. [redacted] stated that it sounds like the Center has thoroughly evaluated the tables. Can you compare the major areas of both tables so [redacted] knows where to improve their table. [redacted]

25X1

25X1 stated that we have given you an evaluation of the short comings of your table, and that a comparison of the tables is not needed.

25X1 15. [redacted] asked what weight was given to past performance.

25X1 [redacted] stated that the green oil and the leaks could not have come at a worse time but that we had accepted [redacted] explanation. Mr. [redacted]

25X1

25X1 [redacted] table had been over engineered and had too many frills. [redacted] said he saw a picture of the [redacted] table

25X1

25X1 and thinks that [redacted] had a more polished job. [redacted] stated that the added items may have given the [redacted] table added points in

25X1

25X1 the evaluation. [redacted] stated that the overall outward appearance of the [redacted] table was better.

25X1

25X1 16. [redacted] stated they are trying to answer for themselves the great difference in cost for the tables. Did frills contribute to these costs. [redacted]

25X1

stated that there were many intangible differences between the tables. [redacted] said intangibles only entered the PI evaluation not the T&E. Both tables basically met specs but that the evaluation had to be time oriented.

25X1 17. [redacted] asked why the purchase was all one buy if tables were required by a certain date. [redacted] stated that this had been

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table

25X1

25X1 aired and discussed. If [redacted] could not have met the production schedule there might have been a split order. He further stated that the T&E report will be distributed throughout the Community and it will state that the fixes have been made to the [redacted] table.

25X1

25X1 18. [redacted] stated that one point has not been covered.

25X1 [redacted] built a prototype at a great loss and a competitor was provided the information free. The competitor is rumored to have received 2 to 3 times as much money for the development. [redacted] stated this was not true—that the amount spent on Contractor~~X~~ for total development was ^{each} within [redacted]. He further stated that we were not buying competition.

25X1

25X1 He also stated that [redacted] would have to answer any questions on contracting.

25X1 19. [redacted] said the only question he raises is evaluating
25X1 the [redacted] table without correcting the temperature problem. Mr.

25X1 [redacted] stated that people realized the table does not ordinarily operate this hot.

25X1 20. [redacted] thanked the group for their time and information.
25X1 [redacted] reiterated that the T&E report on the tables and the corrections will go out to the entire community.

[redacted]
25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7